# A THREE-FACTOR PRODUCT CONSTRUCTION FOR MUTUALLY ORTHOGONAL LATIN SQUARES

Peter J. Dukes and Alan C.H. Ling

January 8, 2014

*In memory of Rolf Rees.*

arXiv:1401.1466v1 [math.CO] 7 Jan 2014

Abstract. It is well known that mutually orthogonal latin squares, or MOLS, admit a (Kronecker) product construction. We show that, under mild conditions, 'triple products' of MOLS can result in a gain of one square. In terms of transversal designs, the technique is to use a construction of Rolf Rees twice: once to obtain a coarse resolution of the blocks after one product, and next to reorganize classes and resolve the blocks of the second product. As consequences, we report a few improvements to the MOLS table and obtain a slight strengthening of the famous theorem of MacNeish.

## 1. Introduction

A *latin square* is an $n \times n$ array with entries from an $n$-element set of symbols such that every row and column exhausts the symbols (with no repetition). Often the symbols are taken to be from $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. The integer $n$ is called the *order* of the square.

Two latin squares $L = (L_{ij})$ and $L' = (L'_{ij})$ of order $n$ are *orthogonal* if $\{(L_{ij}, M_{ij}) : 1 \le i, j \le n\} = \{1, \ldots, n\}^2$; that is, two squares are orthogonal if, when superimposed, all ordered pairs of symbols are distinct.

A family of pairwise orthogonal latin squares is normally called *mutually orthogonal latin squares*, and abbreviated 'MOLS'. The maximum size of a family of MOLS of order $n$ is denoted $N(n)$. It is easy to see that $N(n) \le n - 1$ for $n > 1$, with equality if and only if there exists a projective plane of order $n$. Consequently, $N(q) = q - 1$ for prime powers $q$.

Given latin squares $L$, of order $m$, and $M$, of order $n$, their Kronecker product $L \otimes M$ is a latin square of order $mn$. If $\{L^{(1)}, \ldots, L^{(k)}\}$ and $\{M^{(1)}, \ldots, M^{(k)}\}$ are families of MOLS of orders $m$ and $n$, then $\{L^{(1)} \otimes M^{(1)}, \ldots, L^{(k)} \otimes M^{(k)}\}$ is a family of MOLS of order $mn$. Hence, $N(mn) \ge \min\{N(m), N(n)\}$. Combining this with the above remarks yields a 'basic' lower bound on $N(n)$.

**Theorem 1.1** (MacNeish's Theorem)**.** *If $n = q_1 \ldots q_t$ is factored as a product of powers of distinct primes, then $N(n) \ge \min\{q_i - 1 : i = 1, \ldots, t\}$.*

Although it has long been known [2] that $N(n) \to \infty$ (in fact, $N(n) \ge n^{\frac{1}{14.8}}$ for large $n$ is shown in [1]), MacNeish's Theorem remains the best known result for many values of $n$, particularly when $n$ has a small number of prime power factors about the same size. Our main result is a small improvement directed at these challenging cases.

Research of Peter Dukes is supported by NSERC.

## 2. **Transversal Designs and Resolvability**

In what follows, it is convenient to reformulate our discussion of MOLS using the language of designs.

A *transversal design* $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$ consists of an $nk$-element set of *points* partitioned into $k$ *groups*, each of size $n$, and equipped with a family of $n^2$ *blocks* of size $k$ which are pairwise disjoint transversals of the partition. We have the existence of $r$ MOLS of order $n$ if and only if a $\mathrm{TD}(r+2,n)$ exists. The equivalence is seen by indexing groups of the partition by rows, columns, and symbols from each square.

In a $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$, a *parallel class* of blocks is a set of $n$ blocks which partition the points. If the blocks can be resolved into $n$ parallel classes, such a transversal design is called *resolvable* and denoted $\mathrm{RTD}(k,n)$. The blocks of each parallel class in an $\mathrm{RTD}(k,n)$ can be extended by one new point in an extra group. In this way, it is easy to see that an $\mathrm{RTD}(k,n)$ is equivalent to a $\mathrm{TD}(k+1,n)$.

More generally, a *$\sigma$-parallel class* is a configuration of blocks which covers every point exactly $\sigma$ times. For a list of positive integers $\Sigma = [\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t]$ summing to $n$, a $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$ is $\Sigma$-resolvable if the blocks can be resolved into $\sigma_i$-parallel classes for $i = 1, \ldots, t$. In writing a list $\Sigma$, we use 'exponential notation' such as $\sigma^j$ to abbreviate $j$ occurrences of $\sigma$.

Let us say that a $\mathrm{TD}(k,m)$ admits a $(\sigma,\gamma)$-*group partition* if each of the groups of size $m$ is written on some group $G$, if there exists a subset $H$ of $G$ with $|H| = \sigma$ and there exists a partition $\mathfrak{b}$ of the blocks so that, for every class $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{b}$, the set $\{H * B : B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a $\gamma$-parallel class. We should interpret $H * B$ as $|H|$ blocks obtained under action of $H$ on $B$.

A $\mathrm{TD}(k,m)$ always admits two 'trivial' $(\sigma,\gamma)$-group partitions at each of two extremes. We have a $(1,m)$-group partition, in which $H$ is the identity subgroup and $\mathfrak{b}$ is the trivial partition with all blocks in the same class, and also an $(m,1)$-group partition, in which $H = G$ is the full group and $\mathfrak{b}$ is the partition into singleton block classes. An $\mathrm{RTD}(k,m)$ admits a $(1,1)$-group partition.

The following is a special case of Construction 2 in [5], due to Rolf Rees. A similar construction by the same author later appears in [4] in the context of transversal designs.

**Construction 2.1** (Rees,[4, 5])**.** *Let $\Sigma = [\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t]$. Suppose there exists a $\Sigma$-resolvable $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$ and a $\mathrm{TD}(k,m)$ admitting, for each $i$, a $(\sigma_i,\gamma_i)$-group partition. Then there exists a $\Gamma$-resolvable $\mathrm{TD}(k,mn)$, where $\Gamma$ consists of $m\sigma_i/\gamma_i$ copies of $\gamma_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, t$.*

This is essentially the standard direct product in which blocks of the $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$ are replaced by copies of the $\mathrm{TD}(k,m)$. For resolving, the key idea is this: given a $\sigma$-parallel class $\mathcal{C}$ in the $\mathrm{TD}(k,n)$ and a $(\sigma,\gamma)$-group partition $(H,\mathfrak{b})$ of the $\mathrm{TD}(k,m)$, we can 'split' the occurrences of blocks in $\mathcal{C}$ incident with each point $x$ using bijections onto $\{x\} \times H$ in the product. Then, we can select $\gamma$-parallel classes in the product according to the action of $H$ on $\mathfrak{b}$.

Note that a $(\sigma,\gamma)$-group partition is a stronger hypothesis than is actually needed for the construction in [5], where different subsets of $G$ can be taken in each group. Since we only need the 'easy' group partitions mentioned above, we adopt our stronger, simplified hypothesis for clarity. In any case, with this construction we are ready to state and prove our main result.

**Theorem 2.2.** *For integers $a, b, c$ with $a \leq b \leq c$, we have*

$$N(abc) \geq \min\{N(a)+1, N(b), N(c)\}.$$

*Proof.* Equivalently, we construct an RTD$(k, abc)$ given TD$(k, a)$, RTD$(k, b)$, and RTD$(k, c)$. Put $c = aq + r$, $0 \le r < a$. The last ingredient, an RTD$(k, c)$, can be regarded instead as a $\Sigma$-resolvable TD$(k, c)$, where $\Sigma = [1^r, a^q]$. Apply Construction 2.1, using $(1, a)$- and $(a, 1)$-group partitions of a TD$(k, a)$. The result is a $\Gamma$-resolvable TD$(k, ac)$, where

$$\Gamma = \left[1^{qa^2}, a^r\right].$$

Since $qa^2 + ar = ac > rb$, we may reorganize the classes to obtain a $\Gamma'$-resolvable TD$(k, ac)$, where

$$\Gamma' = \left[1^{qa^2 - r(b-a)}, b^r\right] = \left[1^{ac-rb}, b^r\right].$$

Now, apply Construction 2.1 again with an RTD$(k, b)$, using $(1, 1)$- and $(b, 1)$-group partitions. □

**Corollary 2.3.** *For prime powers $p \le q \le r$, we have $N(pqr) \ge p$.*

In particular, we have 'easy' proofs of $N(18), N(30) \ge 2$. In fact, Rees had already obtained those orthogonal latin squares using his construction, bypassing the step of 'reorganizing' classes. This step is the key contribution of this paper; we next provide an example illustrating its usefulness.

**Example 2.4.** Consider $p = 8$, $q = 9$, $r = 13$. There exists an RTD$(9, 13)$. By amalgamating parallel classes, this can be viewed also as a $[1^5, 8]$-resolvable TD$(9, 13)$. Now, consider a TD$(8, 8)$, which admits both an $(8, 1)$- and a $(1, 8)$-partition. It follows by Construction 2.1 that there exists a $[1^{64}, 8^5]$-resolvable TD$(9, 104)$. Again, by restructuring classes, this can be viewed instead as $[1^{59}, 9^5]$-resolvable. Since there exists an RTD$(9, 9)$, it admits both $(1, 1)$- and $(9, 1)$-group partitions. Applying Construction 2.1 again yields a $[1^{9\times 59}, 1^{5\times 81}]$-resolvable TD$(9, 936)$. In other words, we have an RTD$(9, 936)$ or equivalently a TD$(10, 936)$. This gives $N(936) \ge 8$.

| factorization | | $n$ | $N_{\mathrm{HCD}}(n)$ | $N(n) \ge$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $8 \times 9 \times 13$ | = | 936 | 7 | 8 |
| $8 \times 9 \times 17$ | = | 1224 | 7 | 8 |
| $8 \times 11 \times 13$ | = | 1144 | 7 | 8 |
| $16 \times 17 \times 19$ | = | 5168 | 15 | 16 |
| $16 \times 17 \times 25$ | = | 6800 | 15 | 16 |
| $16 \times 19 \times 31$ | = | 9424 | 15 | 16 |
| $17 \times 19 \times 23$ | = | 7429 | 16 | 17 |
| $17 \times 19 \times 29$ | = | 9367 | 16 | 17 |

TABLE 1. Improvements to the table of MOLS in [3] from Theorem 2.2.

Table 1 gives a list of similar lower bounds on $N(n)$ which improve upon the bounds $N(n) \ge N_{\mathrm{HCD}}(n)$ stated in [3] for $n < 10,000$. In fact, the entries of our table account for all integers $n$ having three or more prime power exact divisors such that $N_{\mathrm{HCD}}(n)$ reports the MacNeish bound.

We should remark that $p, q, r$ need not be assumed relatively prime in Corollary 2.3. For instance, $N(31 \times 2^t) \ge 31$ for $t \ge 10$ by factoring $2^t = 2^5 \times 2^{t-5}$. However, we could find no cases for $n < 10,000$ where splitting prime powers improves the state of the art. We fail to improve $N_{\mathrm{HCD}}(17 \cdot 2^9) = 16$, for instance, since $2^4 < 17$.

In closing, we should also note that Theorem 2.2 can be iterated, though in light of $N(n) \ge n^{\frac{1}{14.8}}$ for large $n$, it is not (at least asymptotically) worthwhile to iterate very often. But, for example, since $N(8 \times 9 \times 13) \ge 8$ and $8 \times 9 \times 13 < 5^5$, we also have $N(8 \times 9 \times 13 \times 5^{10}) \ge 9$.

## References


[1] T. Beth, Eine Bemerkung zur Abschtzung der Anzahl orthogonaler lateinischer Quadrate mittels Siebverfahren. *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* 53 (1983), 284–288.

[2] S. Chowla, P. Erdős, and E.G. Strauss, On the maximal number of pairwise orthogonal latin squres of a given order. *Canad. J. Math.* 12 (1960), 204–208.

[3] C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, eds., The CRC Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, 2nd edition, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2006.

[4] R. Rees, Truncated transversal designs: a new lower bound on the number of idempotent MOLS of side $n$. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 90 (2000), 257–266.

[5] R. Rees, Two new direct product-type constructions for resolvable group-divisible designs. *J. Combin. Des.* 1 (1993) 15–26.



Peter J. Dukes: Mathematics and Statistics, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada

*E-mail address*: dukes@uvic.ca

Alan C.H. Ling: Computer Science, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA

*E-mail address*: aling@cems.uvm.edu